DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 713 HE 007 799

AUTHOR Lyons, Paul R.
TITLE The Evaluation and Impact of the M.S. in Management Degree Program as Reported by Program Graduates.
INSTITUTION Frostburg State Coll., Md.
PUB DATE Mar 76
NOTE 59p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Counseling; Curriculum; Effective Teaching; *Evaluation; Faculty; *Higher Education; Instruction; *Management Development; *Management Education; Skill Development; *Student Opinion; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Frostburg State College

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of the Master of Science in Management degree program of the Center for Management Development of Frostburg State College attempted to answer several questions: (1) Were counseling and advisement services available? (2) Were such services of high quality? (3) Has the program been occupationally valuable for students? (4) Has it been personally valuable? (5) Do students feel more competent/valued/secure as a result of having completed the program? (6) How satisfied are students with the instructional methods/faculty competence/ curriculum organization/effectiveness of the degree program? (7) Of what value were required courses? (8) Have new skills been acquired or have skills been enhanced as a result of completion of the program of study? The evaluation is based on a survey of graduates of the program. Two-thirds of the population investigated responded. It can be concluded that the degree recipients are satisfied with their experience in the program. This document includes survey results, more specific conclusions, recommendations, and a bibliography. The appendix reproduces the questionnaire used in the evaluation. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED122713

The Evaluation and Impact Of The M. S. in Management Degree Program As Reported By Program Graduates

By

Paul R. Lyons, Ph.D.

March, 1976

FROSTBURG STATE COLLEGE
Frostburg, Maryland 21532

HE 007 799

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Acknowledgements

Many individuals cooperated in the production of this evaluation. Special thanks to the faculty of the Center for Management Development, and to the instrument review panel (Mr. Anthony Crosby, Dr. Joseph Malak, Dr. Edward Root, Dr. Carleton Shore, and Dr. Kenneth Stewart). Special thanks are in order for Mrs. Jeanne Golden and Mrs. Wilma Summerfield, who provided logistical and clerical support for the study.

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
Acknowledgements	2
Statement of Purpose	3
Background Information	3
Justification for the Study	5
Objectives	5
Follow-Up Studies -- General	6
Delimitations of the Investigation	7
Population	7
Questionnaire	7
Passage of Time	8
Procedures	8
Definition of Population Surveyed	8
Table 1 - Rate of Response By Year of Graduation	8
Development of Questionnaire	9
Data Management	10
Data Analysis	10
Organization of Analysis	11
Results	11
General Information (Questionnaire Items 1-5)	11-14
Personal Information (Questionnaire Items 6-11)	14-18
Curriculum -- General (Questionnaire Items 12, 13, 17-21)	18-22
Curriculum -- Courses	23-37
Table 2 - Comparative Ratings of Selected Courses	24
Skill Development	38-42
Table 3 - Skill Area Statements - Combined Responses	38

Table of Contents

Continued

Contents	Page
Conclusions	42
Recommendations	44
Bibliography	45
Appendix	46-56

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this investigation was to find answers for several questions raised in an attempt to evaluate various aspects of the Master of Science (M.S.) in Management degree program of the Center for Management Development (CMD) of Frostburg State College. The evaluation of the program as represented in this report is based upon a survey of graduates of the program. Some of the questions for which answers were sought were: Were counseling and advisement services available? Were such services of high quality? Has the program been occupationally valuable for students? Has it been personally valuable? Do students feel more competent; more valued; more secure as a result of having entered and completed the program? How satisfied are students with the instructional methods, faculty competence, curriculum organization, and the effectiveness of the degree program? Of what value were required courses? Have new skills been acquired or have skills been enhanced as a result of completion of the program of study? The answers to these questions and similar questions can aid in overall program evaluation and can provide evidence concerning the impact of the program on students.

Background Information

The Master of Science in Management degree program of study was developed in cooperation with area businesses and industries during the late 1960's. Originally, the program was intended solely for students within the business and industrial environment, but as the program developed and evolved, and as the needs of all types of organizations in the region were assessed, the program was modified to reflect a general management orientation or point of view. In order to serve all of Western Maryland

and environs, the program of study is offered in three locations: Frostburg, Hagerstown, and Frederick. The program of study in its entirety is offered at each of these sites and, in addition, program courses in sequence, are offered in Garrett County, Maryland.

Students attracted to the program have varied backgrounds and represent many different kinds of organizations and many different types of baccalaureate degree experiences. More than 90 percent of all students in the degree program are part-time students enrolled for either one or two 3-credit courses per semester. Approximately 90 percent of the students are men and the average age of students is 38. Enrollment is divided almost equally among the three major instructional sites. All instruction is carried out in conjunction with a local college as host in each of the off-campus sites.

Many of the degree program students have baccalaureate degrees in an engineering field or in business administration. These fields represent the greatest concentration of baccalaureate degrees held by students, although many students possess baccalaureate degrees in the liberal arts; education; biological, physical and natural sciences; or other fields of study. Most students are employed in large businesses, industries, and in federal service (military and civilian). Many are employed in education organizations, hospitals, and many are employed in small businesses or are proprietors of small businesses.

The primary objective of the degree program is to provide individuals with the opportunity to develop the skills and concepts of general managers and administrators. With the acquisition of these basic managerial skills and concepts, the student has a framework for the ongoing process of self-education and self-development as a manager that is necessary to meet the changing and increasingly complex management problems of the future.

The program designed to fulfill these objectives consists of a 42 semester credit program of study comprised of 30 credits of required courses and 12 credits of electives. The required courses are grouped into three sequential clusters which serve to: (1) develop a foundation for examining the managerial environment; (2) develop special functional relationships in knowledge regarding processes, resources, and the like; and (3) develop an integrative review of managerial processes, functions, and activities.

Justification for the Study

The program in question was subject to extensive formative evaluation from 1969-1973. Program purposes, objectives, curriculum design and organization, were formulated and reformulated. Commencing with the first graduating class in 1971 up to the present time (1975) there had been no attempt to conduct a comprehensive summative evaluation of the program. There had occurred, however, course evaluations and evaluation of specific aspects of the program during this time. The program had grown from a handful of students in 1969 to 350 students in 1975. Since 1970, 194 students have graduated from the program with the M.S. degree. The number of students in the program, the growth potential of the program, and the resources allocated to the program demand that the impact of this effort be measured in some way in order that strengths may be identified and reinforced and in order that weaknesses be identified and ameliorated.

Objectives

Primary objectives of the study were:

(1) To gather basic information from former students which would aid the CMD Directors, the Director of Graduate Studies, and the Graduate Studies Committee (governance agent) evaluate

the impact, effectiveness, content, scope, and quality of the M.S. in management degree program of study;

(2) To provide an evaluation report which could be shared with the academic community and among prospective students, and the public; and

(3) To provide a data base upon which program and course changes could be established.

Secondary objectives of the study were:

(1) To provide program graduates the opportunity to reflect upon their academic experience; and

(2) To provide, in essence, an instructional vehicle whereby faculty and staff might participate in a learning experience ultimately aimed at improving performance.

Follow-Up Studies — General

Follow-up studies are considered to be one form of summative evaluation. In the case of this investigation a student population served is expected to provide the institution with some assessment of how the educational experience, as provided, has affected the population served.

While many follow-up studies are conducted as in-house projects in various colleges, universities, and school systems, there have been several such studies completed on a large scale with national implications. Notable among such investigations were those conducted by Freedman (2), Flanagan (1), and Pace (4).

Most follow-up studies conducted in colleges and universities are done on a departmental or college-wide basis, and the data and information generated is not usually disseminated for use outside the institution. Examination of Education Abstracts, Dissertation Abstracts, ERIC Clearinghouse

reports listings, and the Current Index to Journals in Education yielded very little material on follow-up studies, generally.

Notable among the few documents which examine the uses and abuses of follow-up studies is a paper by Taylor (6) which reports the results of a critical review of 95 follow-up studies. Taylor used evaluative criteria established by Strauss (5) to measure the value of these studies. The strengths and weaknesses of follow-up studies are carefully articulated in Taylor's paper, and the present investigation has attempted to combine and use the suggestions of Taylor and Strauss in order to present a useful and meaningful report. The research reported in this investigation is explained in sufficient detail to permit another researcher at Frostburg State College or any college to replicate the study.

Delimitations of the Investigation

Population — All recipients of the degree, M.S. in Management, earned at Frostburg State College were mailed the evaluation instrument. This population numbered 194, and of the 194 individuals identified as the population, 8 could not be reached (with repeated mailings) hence, the population contacted numbered 186. Of the 186 individuals contacted, 125 returned useable questionnaires. This represented a return of 67.2 percent. While this is not an extremely high rate of return, it nevertheless is a substantial rate of return for this type of survey evaluation (Kerlinger, p. 397). The population average age was 38, and all members of the population were males, save one.

Questionnaire — All elements of the population were mailed a questionnaire comprised mostly of fixed-choice response items. The use of a mailed questionnaire does not allow the researcher to: check on responses; ask highly complex questions; or to structure the responding environment.

The mailed questionnaire does not allow for easy verification of responses, nor can the researcher be certain of the identity of the respondent. The mailed questionnaire is inexpensive and easy to administer; it permits anonymity, and it guarantees, usually, uniform presentation.

Passage of Time -- The majority of graduates of the program completed the program within the past 20 months. Many graduates completed the program as many as four or five years ago. Responses may have been affected by length of time intervening since program enrollment.

Procedures

Definition of Population Surveyed

Most of the relevant details of the population were presented in the preceding section. It was assumed that those individuals who responded to the questionnaire were representative of the population of individuals surveyed. In Table 1, below, appears the rate of response by year of graduation. At least 50 percent of each group (per year) responded.

Table 1

Rate of Response to Questionnaire
By Year of Graduation

Year of Graduation	Number Of Graduates	Number of Graduates Responding*	Percentage of Graduates Responding*
1971	14	7	50.0%
1972	19	19	100.0%
1973	38	22	57.9%
1974	55	32	58.2%
1975	68	45	66.2%
Total	194	125	64.4%

*Figures not adjusted for those graduates not reached by mail.

When respondents not reached by mail are eliminated from the respondent pool, the return rate becomes 67.2 percent.

Development of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire used as the survey instrument was developed over time and evolved into a finished product as the result of activities segmented into the following phases:

(1) Development - The faculty of CMD and the director of graduate studies first listed a set of questions about the program to which answers were desired. These questions reflect the basic purpose and objectives of the survey. The broad categories of questions had to do with adequacy of support resources; quality of advisement and counseling; personal valuing; quality of faculty, curriculum, instructional methods and organization; valuing of specific courses; and, evaluation of skills development.

(2) Questionnaire Draft - The questions were translated into items for a questionnaire. Most items were of the closed-end, fixed-response type.

(3) Review Panel - A panel of five individuals (other than CMD faculty) was asked to critique the draft questionnaire for organization, clarity, and, in the case of general evaluative items, content. All of the individuals queried had published research in major journals and all had previously performed survey research. All panel members submitted modifications for inclusion in the revised draft.

(4) Revised Draft - The revision of the questionnaire which incorporated the suggestions of the review panel was pre-

sented to the CMD faculty for final content validation.

(5) Field Testing - As a final step, the questionnaire was presented to a sample of staff members who were asked to complete the questionnaire according to instructions. Ambiguities reported in items (questions) and instructions were then corrected while maintaining the intent of the items.

A copy of the questionnaire is found in the appendix of this report.

Data Management

Specific details of data management are reported in the appendix. The data elements were placed on data processing coding sheets as questionnaires were received and item responses transferred from questionnaire forms to coding sheets. The processing of questionnaires and the logistics of the survey as an activity are documented in the appendix.

Data Analysis

While the data and information generated in this investigation may be subject to relatively sophisticated analysis for a variety of research questions, the purpose of this investigation was to obtain straight-forward answers to straight-forward questions, and since the product of the investigation was to be disseminated to various and diverse audiences, it was decided to limit the data treatment to a frequency analysis of each item. Items are examined individually and as they contribute to knowledge regarding broader aspects of the program in question. All questionnaire input data was processed via the CODEBOOK data analysis program of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS-Version 5). The SPSS is made available to users from the Maryland State Colleges Information Center located at Towson State College in Baltimore.

Organization of Analysis

Each questionnaire item is displayed in table form to allow for ease of examination. As these tables present information which is self-evident, comment concerning interpretation and analysis is minimal. Major groupings of items contain summaries of pertinent information. These major groups are: General Information, Personal Information, Curriculum--General, Curriculum--Courses, and Skill Development.

Results

General Information (Items 1 through 5)

With reference to location (Item 2) it should be noted that the Frostburg site has offered instructional services for the program several years longer than other sites. Instruction in Martinsburg terminated in 1974.

Item 3 has to do with access to library resources and the perceived affect of access on progress in the degree program. The pattern of responses was anticipated as the bulk of resources required for courses are purchased by students. The case method of instruction, which is used extensively in most program courses, traditionally has not relied to a great extent on ancillary materials and research journals.

Program advisement and counseling was given a positive rating indicating a relatively high level of satisfaction with this program element. Considering the fact that most students are part-time students and that little, regular, face-to-face advising services were available at off-campus sites, except for registration sessions, the response obtained seems quite positive.

General Information

Questionnaire Item #1

In what year did you receive your M.S. in Management degree?

Year	Number	% of Total
1971	7	5.6
1972	19	15.2
1973	22	17.6
1974	32	25.6
1975	45	36.0
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #2

Where did you complete the majority of course work in your M.S. in Management degree program?

Location	Number	% of Total
Frostburg	55	44.0
Hagerstown	30	24.0
Frederick	36	28.8
Garrett	0	0.0
Martinsburg	4	3.2
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #3

If you were enrolled in the program in one of the off-campus locations, you did not have easy access to the FSC Library. This is not to say that you did not have access to other libraries and similar types of resources. Did the lack of easy access to the FSC library in your area of attendance affect your progress in the program?

Affect on progress	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	52	41.6
Made no difference	46	36.8
Made little difference	19	15.2
Undecided	6	4.8
Hindered progress somewhat	2	1.6
Greatly hindered progress	0	0.0
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #4

With reference to your seeking program advice and counsel while enrolled as a student in the M.S. in Management program, would you please indicate the category below which characterizes your experience?

Advisement	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	3	2.4
Advisement readily available	78	62.4
Available but contacting faculty difficult at times	36	28.8
Undecided	3	2.4
Advisement not readily available	2	1.6
Advisement practically inaccessible	3	2.4
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #5

How satisfied were you with the quality of the advisement and program counseling you received?

Quality of advisement	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	4	3.2
Extremely satisfied	59	47.2
Somewhat satisfied	48	38.4
Undecided	7	5.6
Somewhat dissatisfied	6	4.8
Extremely dissatisfied	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

Personal Information (Items 6 through 11)

Almost all students (96 percent) reported that they felt more competent or extremely more competent as a result of their experience in the program. Not one respondent indicated that the program did not fulfill in some way his personal purposes for enrolling in the program. About four respondents in five felt that they are more valued by their peers as a result of having completed the program of study. About three respondents in five felt more secure in their particular occupational setting as a result of successfully completing the degree program.

Analysis of Item 10 reveals that at least 49 percent of the respondents had received one of the following: a promotion; an advance in salary; or more job responsibility. About one-third of the respondents reported, "None of these." This information is not intended to imply a

cause and effect relationship between program experience and resultant job experience.

With reference to Item 11, almost three-fourths of the respondents reported that the program had been moderately or extremely valuable to them, occupationally. On the other hand, 11 percent reported that their experience in the program had not materially enhanced them, occupationally. And, perhaps most surprisingly, 14.4 percent were not sure. This issue needs further investigation given the relatively negative response (especially when compared to other items in this section).

Personal Information

Questionnaire Item #6

With my degree and experiences in the management program, I feel:

Competency	Number	% of Total
Extremely competent in position	26	20.8
More competent in position	94	75.2
No change	4	3.2
Less competent in position	0	0.0
Inadequate in position	0	0.0
No response	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #7

Because of the program, I feel that I have achieved my personal purposes in enrolling in the program:

Purposes Achieved	Number	% of Total
Completely	45	36.0
For the most part	62	49.6
To a limited extent	17	13.6
Slightly	0	0.0
Not at all	0	0.0
No response	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #8

Because of my degree in the management program, I feel:

Value by Peers	Number	% of Total
Very highly valued by peers	12	9.6
More valued by peers	84	67.2
No change in value	27	21.6
Less valued by peers	0	0.0
Not valued by peers	0	0.0
No response	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #9

With my degree and experience in the management program, I feel:

Security in Position	Number	% of Total
Extremely secure in position	21	16.8
More secure in position	56	44.8
No change in security	46	36.8
Less secure in position	0	0.0
Insecure in position	0	0.0
No response	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #10

With my degree and experiences in the management program, I have been: (Promoted, advanced in salary, given more responsibility, other, none of these) Choose 1 or more.

	Number	% of Total
Promotion Received	37	29.6
No response	88	70.4
Total	125	100.0
Advanced in Salary	45	36.0
No response	80	64.0
Total	125	100.0
Given More Responsibility	52	41.6
No Response	73	58.4
Total	125	100.0
Other	22	17.6
No Response	103	82.4
Total	125	100.0
None of these	42	33.6
No Response	83	66.4
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #11

In general, how valuable occupationally has your M.S. in Management educational experience been?

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	2	1.6
Extremely valuable	39	31.2
Moderately valuable	52	41.6
Undecided	18	14.4
Of relatively little value	11	8.8
Of no value	3	2.4
Total	125	100.0

Curriculum - General (Items 12, 13, 17-21)

Item 12 articulated the basic premise of the degree program, that is, that the most relevant program of study for supervisors and managers is a program that attempts to develop general types of skills. Of the respondents, 92 percent have found the general management orientation of the program to be valuable. Yet, 39 percent (Item 13) believe that more specific emphases would be valuable, too. A concentration of elective courses may aid an individual student to obtain a specialization of sorts, however, many of the electives are not offered frequently enough to permit such a "minor" specialization to occur. This situation is a reflection of both the size of the program and the special needs many students possess. That is, if the enrollment of the program was significantly increased, it would then be possible to offer more electives on a cost-effective basis.

In terms of level of difficulty of courses, almost 18 percent of the respondents answered "Undecided" to this question. The question may not

have been too meaningful in that each course could be rated differently by the same student. The question may have been ambiguous, although the general pattern of responses parallels response patterns of other items.

Almost 90 percent of the respondents reported that they were satisfied with the instructional faculty. The majority of faculty are part-time, and during the past five years there had been almost 100 percent turnover in part-time faculty. It may be more valuable to examine these data on a year-by-year basis. In terms of student satisfaction concerning instructional methods and organization and effectiveness of the instructional program, it can be observed that for each of these variables at least 85.6 percent of the respondents expressed satisfaction with no more than 10.4 percent expressing some degree of dissatisfaction. Again, this evidence may be construed as a positive valuing of the program.

Curriculum - General

Questionnaire Item #12

The emphasis in the M.S. in Management is on general management, that is, the emphasis is on providing educational opportunities (skills, abilities, frame of reference) for managers and employees of a wide variety of organizations, both large and small, from the public, private, and non-profit sectors. - How valuable has the emphasis on general management been for you?

Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	1	.8
Extremely valuable	46	36.8
Moderately valuable	69	55.2
Difficult to decide	3	2.4
Of relatively little value	6	4.8
Of no value whatsoever	0	0.0
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #13

Would more specific management emphasis have been valuable?

Response	Number	% of Total
Yes	49	39.2
No	73	58.4
No Response	3	2.4
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #17

Are the courses taught at an appropriate level of difficulty?

Difficulty Level	Number	% of Total
Appropriate	31	24.8
Less appropriate	58	46.4
Undecided	22	17.6
Somewhat inappropriate	7	5.6
Inappropriate	3	2.4
No response	4	3.2
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #18

In terms of your overall educational experience in the Frostburg State College M.S. in Management Program how satisfied are you with the instructional faculty?

Faculty	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	3	2.4
Extremely satisfied	37	29.6
Moderately satisfied	75	60.0
Undecided	3	2.4
Moderately dissatisfied	6	4.8
Extremely dissatisfied	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #19

In terms of your overall educational experience in the Frostburg State College M.S. in Management Program, how satisfied are you with instructional methods?

Instructional Methods	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	1	.8
Extremely satisfied	46	36.8
Moderately satisfied	67	53.6
Undecided	2	1.6
Moderately dissatisfied	9	7.2
Extremely dissatisfied	0	0.0
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #20

In terms of your overall educational experience in the Frostburg State College M.S. in Management Program, how satisfied are you with the instructional organization?

Instructional Organization	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	2	1.6
Extremely satisfied	46	36.8
Moderately satisfied	61	48.8
Difficult to decide	3	2.4
Moderately dissatisfied	12	9.6
Extremely dissatisfied	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

Questionnaire Item #21

In terms of your overall educational experience in the Frostburg State College M.S. in Management Program, how satisfied are you with the effectiveness of the instructional program?

Program Effectiveness	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	1	.8
Extremely satisfied	43	34.4
Moderately satisfied	64	51.2
Undecided	10	8.0
Moderately dissatisfied	7	5.6
Extremely dissatisfied	0	0.0
Total	125	100.0

Curriculum - Courses

The information contained in the evaluation of each course on the two dimensions (Occupational Value; Personal Value) has import for curriculum analysis. While the course ratings data can be examined in a variety of ways, it was decided to examine emergent patterns and relationships of only those courses for which at least 50 percent of the respondents supplied an evaluative rating. Ten of the thirteen courses meet this criterion. The courses that do not meet the criterion are: (1) 510 - Finance; (2) 512 - Process and Operations Management; and (3) 698 - Management Consulting. In examining the ten courses (combining the two positive response categories--extremely/moderately valuable; and the two negative response categories--little/no value) one learns that there is an extremely close relationship between ratings on the two dimensions (occupational; personal value) across the ten courses. The relationship can be numerically expressed as .96 using the Spearman formula for rank order correlation. This represents a nearly perfect relationship, i.e. a course rated as high on occupational value has a correspondingly high rating for personal value.

The courses with the highest ratings were the Managerial Policy and Planning courses (I and II) closely followed by 501 - Human Behavior in Organizations. The negative ratings for these same courses were low, with the 501 course receiving only 4 percent negative ratings. The next most positively rated courses were 504 - Managerial Accounting; 506 - Quantitative Analysis; and 508 - Environmental Analysis, in that order. On the negative side, courses 506, 508, and 504 had the most negative ratings among the 10 courses under study on the occupational value dimension and on the personal value dimension. The negative ratings

expressed as a percent of responses for these three courses were approximately double that of the negative ratings of the three most positively rated courses. Table 2 below displays the ratings of the six courses in question. Obviously, the remaining four courses of the ten courses being examined possess ratings which fall within the limits of ratings (positive and negative) established by the course ratings in Table 2.

Table 2

Comparative Ratings of Selected Courses

Course	Occupational Value		Personal Value	
	% Responding Positively	% Responding Negatively	% Responding Positively	% Responding Negatively
Hi Group:				
690	68.8	7.2	64.0	6.4
691	67.2	7.2	63.2	6.4
501	59.2	4.0	60.8	4.0
Lo Group:				
506	48.8	12.8	52.0	8.8
508	41.6	15.2	43.2	16.0
504	52.0	16.8	60.8	9.6

These data may or may not be indicative of particular strengths or weaknesses. More study will be required before any meaningful decisions can be made concerning these courses. Of the three courses rated most positively, one course (501) is usually the first course taken by a student, and the remaining two courses (690, 691) are usually among the final courses a student completes in fulfilling degree requirements.

Curriculum - Courses

Required Courses - Even though the M.S. in Management curriculum has been revised twice during the past five years, most graduates of the program have taken all or most of the following required courses. Please indicate the courses you took; then rate each course, first in terms of its value to you in your present occupational setting and secondly, in terms of its personal value to you.

Course Title: Human Behavior in Organizations
Course Number: 501

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	41	32.8
Extremely valuable	42	33.6
Moderately valuable	32	25.6
Difficult to decide	5	4.0
Of relatively little value	3	2.4
Of no value whatsoever	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Human Behavior in Organizations
Course Number: 501

Personal Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	40	32.0
Extremely valuable	49	39.2
Moderately valuable	27	21.6
Difficult to decide	4	3.2
Of relatively little value	3	2.4
Of no value whatsoever	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Managerial Accounting
Course Number: 504

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	32	25.6
Extremely valuable	27	21.6
Moderately valuable	38	30.4
Difficult to decide	7	5.6
Of relatively little value	17	13.6
Of no value whatsoever	4	3.2
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Managerial Accounting
Course Number: 504

Personal Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	30	24.0
Extremely valuable	42	33.6
Moderately valuable	34	27.2
Difficult to decide	7	5.6
Of relatively little value	5	4.0
Of no value whatsoever	7	5.6
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Quantitative Analysis in Decision-Making
Course Number: 506

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	38	30.4
Extremely valuable	25	20.0
Moderately valuable	36	28.8
Difficult to decide	10	8.0
Of relatively little value	12	9.6
Of no value whatsoever	4	3.2
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Quantitative Analysis in Decision-Making
Course Number: 506

Personal Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	38	30.4
Extremely valuable	29	23.2
Moderately valuable	36	28.8
Difficult to decide	11	8.8
Of relatively little value	6	4.8
Of no value whatsoever	5	4.0
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Environmental Analysis
Course Number: 508

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	41	32.8
Extremely valuable	24	19.2
Moderately valuable	28	22.4
Difficult to decide	13	10.4
Of relatively little value	17	13.6
Of no value whatsoever	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Environmental Analysis
Course Number: 508

Personal Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	40	32.0
Extremely valuable	31	24.8
Moderately valuable	23	18.4
Difficult to decide	11	8.8
Of relatively little value	16	12.8
Of no value whatsoever	4	3.2
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Finance
Course Number: 510

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	69	55.2
Extremely valuable	17	13.6
Moderately valuable	17	13.6
Difficult to decide	9	7.2
Of relatively little value	10	8.0
Of no value whatsoever	3	2.4
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Finance
Course Number: 510

Personal Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	68	54.4
Extremely valuable	19	15.2
Moderately valuable	27	21.6
Difficult to decide	3	2.4
Of relatively little value	6	4.8
Of no value whatsoever	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Process (Production) and Operations Management
Course Number: 512

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	68	54.4
Extremely valuable	20	16.0
Moderately valuable	22	17.6
Difficult to decide	2	1.6
Of relatively little value	11	8.8
Of no value whatsoever	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Process (Production) and Operations Management
Course Number: 512

Personal Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	68	54.4
Extremely valuable	17	13.6
Moderately valuable	19	15.2
Difficult to decide	8	6.4
Of relatively little value	10	8.0
Of no value whatsoever	3	2.4
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Marketing
Course Number: 514

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	62	49.6
Extremely valuable	11	8.8
Moderately valuable	31	24.8
Difficult to decide	6	4.8
Of relatively little value	11	8.8
Of no value whatsoever	4	3.2
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Marketing
Course Number: 514

Personal Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	62	49.6
Extremely valuable	16	12.8
Moderately valuable	26	20.8
Difficult to decide	14	11.2
Of relatively little value	5	4.0
Of no value whatsoever	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Production, Marketing, Finance I
Course Number: 616

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	56	44.8
Extremely valuable	16	12.8
Moderately valuable	33	26.4
Difficult to decide	12	9.6
Of relatively little value	6	4.8
Of no value whatsoever	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Production, Marketing, Finance I
Course Number: 616

Personal Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	56	44.8
Extremely valuable	16	12.8
Moderately valuable	31	24.8
Difficult to decide	14	11.2
Of relatively little value	5	4.0
Of no value whatsoever	3	2.4
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Production, Marketing, Finance II
Course Number: 620

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	61	48.8
Extremely valuable	16	12.8
Moderately valuable	30	24.0
Difficult to decide	11	8.8
Of relatively little value	6	4.8
Of no value whatsoever	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Production, Marketing, Finance II
Course Number: 620

Personal Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	60	48.0
Extremely valuable	16	12.8
Moderately valuable	30	24.0
Difficult to decide	12	9.6
Of relatively little value	5	4.0
Of no value whatsoever	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Managerial Policy and Planning I
Course Number: 690

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	19	15.2
Extremely valuable	39	31.2
Moderately valuable	47	37.6
Difficult to decide	11	8.8
Of relatively little value	7	5.6
Of no value whatsoever	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Managerial Policy and Planning I
Course Number: 690

Personal Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	19	15.2
Extremely valuable	38	30.4
Moderately valuable	42	33.6
Difficult to decide	18	14.4
Of relatively little value	7	5.6
Of no value whatsoever	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Managerial Policy and Planning II
Course Number: 691

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	22	17.6
Extremely valuable	40	32.0
Moderately valuable	44	35.2
Difficult to decide	10	8.0
Of relatively little value	7	5.6
Of no value whatsoever	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Managerial Policy and Planning II
Course Number: 691

Personal Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	22	17.6
Extremely valuable	39	31.2
Moderately valuable	40	32.0
Difficult to decide	16	12.8
Of relatively little value	7	5.6
Of no value whatsoever	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Management Consulting
Course Number: 698

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	97	77.6
Extremely valuable	10	8.0
Moderately valuable	7	5.6
Difficult to decide	4	3.2
Of relatively little value	6	4.8
Of no value whatsoever	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Management Consulting
Course Number: 698

Personal Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	94	75.2
Extremely valuable	24	19.2
Moderately valuable	4	3.2
Difficult to decide	3	2.4
Of relatively little value	0	0.0
Of no value whatsoever	0	0.0
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Advanced Management Problems
Course Number: 699

Occupational Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	62	49.6
Extremely valuable	27	21.6
Moderately valuable	19	15.2
Difficult to decide	8	6.4
Of relatively little value	5	4.0
Of no value whatsoever	4	3.2
Total	125	100.0

Course Title: Advanced Management Problems
Course Number: 699

Personal Value	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	61	48.8
Extremely valuable	29	23.2
Moderately valuable	20	16.0
Difficult to decide	5	4.0
Of relatively little value	5	4.0
Of no value whatsoever	5	4.0
Total	125	100.0

Skill Development

The skill areas identified in this section are those specific performance elements upon which the evaluation of students in the program is based. That is, the purposes and objectives of the master's degree program are translated into these performance objectives. Criteria for evaluating student performance, in each course, are based upon these performance elements.

Examination of the responses concerning the seven skill areas indicates that at least 76 percent of the respondents believed their skills were enhanced as a result of experience in the degree program. Problem identification skills were seen as most enhanced while plan implementation and communication skill development were areas reported as least enhanced. It would seem that these latter two areas would warrant primary attention for needed curriculum improvements. When the responses for the seven skill area statements are combined as in Table 3, one observes that slightly more than 84 percent of all responses were of a positive nature. This is evidence of the positive value of the program.

Table 3

Skill Area Statements - Combined Responses

Skills (Enhanced)	Number	% of Total
Not Applicable	19	2.2
Greatly Enhanced	358	40.9
Slightly Enhanced	380	43.4
Difficult to Decide	67	7.7
Very Little Difference	41	4.7
No Value	10	1.1
Total	875	100.0

Overall, this analysis has been cursory. It represents a beginning, a point of departure. Much more detailed, careful analyses will be required to answer some questions.

Skill Development

This section has to do with the acquisition and/or development of a particular set of skills relative to your experience in the M.S. in Management degree program. Please assign one of the following statements to each of the skill area statements below: Not applicable; I believe my experience in the program has greatly enhanced my managerial skills in this area; I believe my experience in the program has slightly enhanced my managerial skills in this area; Difficult to decide; I believe my experience in the program has made very little difference in my skill level in this area; I believe my experience in the program has had no value in my being more skilled in this area.

Skill Area Statement:

The identification of problems and the assigning of priorities to these problems.

	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	2	1.6
Greatly enhanced	69	55.2
Slightly enhanced	49	39.2
Difficult to decide	4	3.2
Very little difference	1	.8
No value	0	0.0
Total	125	100.0

Skill Area Statement:

Taking the administrative point of view.

	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	2	1.6
Greatly enhanced	63	50.4
Slightly enhanced	48	38.4
Difficult to decide	7	5.6
Very little difference	4	3.2
No value	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

Skill Area Statement:

The development of alternative courses of action.

	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	3	2.4
Greatly enhanced	56	44.8
Slightly enhanced	53	42.4
Difficult to decide	10	8.0
Very little difference	2	1.6
No value	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

Skill Area Statement:

Recommending and justifying a course of action (presupposes establishment of criteria and explicit recognition of assumptions).

	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	3	2.4
Greatly enhanced	47	37.6
Slightly enhanced	63	50.4
Difficult to decide	9	7.2
Very little difference	3	2.4
No value	0	0.0
Total	125	100.0

Skill Area Statement:

Development of implementation plans.

	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	2	1.6
Greatly enhanced	36	28.8
Slightly enhanced	59	47.2
Difficult to decide	15	12.0
Very little difference	12	9.6
No value	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

Skill Area Statement:

Recognition of future implications relative to implementation plans.

	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	4	3.2
Greatly enhanced	48	38.4
Slightly enhanced	52	41.6
Difficult to decide	16	12.8
Very little difference	4	3.2
No value	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

Skill Area Statement:

Development of communicative skills.

	Number	% of Total
Not applicable	3	2.4
Greatly enhanced	39	31.2
Slightly enhanced	56	44.8
Difficult to decide	6	4.8
Very little difference	15	12.0
No value	6	4.8
Total	125	100.0

Conclusions

Given that approximately two-thirds of the population under investigation supplied responses to questions, it can be concluded that M.S. in Management degree recipients are quite satisfied with their experience in the program of study. The respondents were asked to evaluate the effects of their program experience on their personal growth, and on their occupational performance. The expression, "quite satisfied" can be operationally defined as follows: since from 60 to 95 percent of evaluative ratings per item were placed in the positive domain demonstrating a positive valuing of the aspects of the program, it follows that satisfaction with the program was high.

The respondents indicated that advisement and counseling services and availability of same were adequate, hence maintenance of effort in this area is appropriate. There was a 50 percent coincidence between success in the program and receipt of promotion, or advance in salary, or increased job

responsibility. This growth corresponds to positive clusters of responses with reference to feelings of personal achievement, valuing by peers, occupational security, and occupational competence. This demonstrates, again, satisfaction with the program and its perceived effects.

Respondents seem quite satisfied with the general management orientation of the degree program, yet many desire more specific emphases. The issue could not be brought into focus with the set of responses generated. More study is required. The issue of level of difficulty of courses is one that also required further study as 18 percent of the respondents were undecided. In terms of the important areas of satisfaction with instructional faculty, instructional methods, instructional organization, and effectiveness of the program, at least 85.6 percent of the respondents expressed satisfaction with each of the four areas. This would indicate that there is no compelling reason to significantly alter these variables in the near future.

Since the program has undergone some revision in recent years and since a great many of the graduates did not complete some of the now-required functional-type courses, more study will be required before meaningful conclusions can be drawn.

In the area of development of specific skills, it seems that greater attention is required in the areas of developing communications skills, and in that area of instruction which deals with the translation of decisions to operations processes, procedures, evaluation, and the like. Other skill development factors appear to be appropriately emphasized in the curriculum.

Several open-ended items were included in the evaluation instrument. Responses to these items were sporadic, at best, and no analysis of these responses has been undertaken. The comments generated may be of some use, however.

Recommendations

1. In order to provide continuity in evaluation and in order to use the present set of data as baseline measures, the present investigation (with appropriate additional emphases) should be replicated for each of the next two graduating classes (1976, 1977) of the Center for Management Development.

2. A form of employee evaluation may be desirable for having the graduate's employer rate the graduate's functioning, competence, and organizational contributions as these factors may relate to educational experiences.

3. More study is required in the following areas:

   a. level of difficulty of courses; and

   b. specific program concentration vs. the general management orientation.

4. Careful attention should be given to ways in which the curriculum might be altered to effect positive change in the skill development areas of: communications skills and implementation of managerial-type decisions.

Bibliography

1. Flanagan, J. C., F. B. Davis, J. T. Dailey, M. F. Shaycoft, D. B. Orr, I. Goldberg, and C. A. Neyman, Jr., 1964, Project TALENT, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Cooperative Research Project No. 635, Pittsburgh, Pa.

2. Freedman, M. B., 1962, Studies of College Alumni, in N. Sanford (Ed.) The American College, pp. 847-886, New York: Wiley.

3. Kerlinger, F. N., 1964, Foundations of Behavioral Research, pp. 392-408, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

4. Pace, C. R., 1941, They Went To College, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

5. Strauss, S., 1969, "Guidelines for Analysis of Research Reports," Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 63, December, pp. 165-169.

6. Taylor, A. L., 1970, Research Methods for Conducting Follow-Up Studies in Higher Education, in P. S. Wright (Ed.) Institutional Research and Communication in Higher Education (Proceedings of the annual forum of The Association for Institutional Research), pp. 242-245, Berkeley, California.

APPENDIX

FROSTBURG STATE COLLEGE
FROSTBURG, MARYLAND 21532

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Dear

I am requesting your assistance in the evaluation of various aspects of the academic program at Frostburg State College. The College's graduate programs are being evaluated as part of an on-going process of study for improvement. In addition, the College is preparing for its decennial accreditation visit by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

You are being asked to assist the Graduate Studies Office in this important work of assessing how well the College is doing its job. As you have earned a master's degree at Frostburg State College (either on campus or by extension), we believe your perceptions and opinions as recorded on the enclosed questionnaire will represent the most valuable kind of information we can obtain regarding the functioning of our graduate program.

Thank you in advance for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Nelson P. Guild
President

NPG:mw

Enclosure

SURVEY OF STUDENT OPINION ON SELECTED
ASPECTS OF THE MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN MANAGEMENT DEGREE PROGRAM

The Graduate Studies Office is requesting that you respond to the several items in this questionnaire in order that we may have access to your evaluative judgments concerning various aspects of the M.S. in Management degree program. As you were successful in this program we value your opinion and urge you to complete and return this questionnaire.

INSTRUCTIONS

You can be assured that your responses are guaranteed anonymity. You will notice that the return envelope has your address label on it. This is for materials control purposes only. When we receive your completed questionnaire, we record the fact that you returned one, then we throw the empty envelope out. In this way we know which alumni we need to contact a second time.

You will find that most of the items in the questionnaire require you to respond with an "X" or check-mark in a particular response set. There are several open-ended items, too.

Your responses will form the basis for our evaluation of the program, hence it is important that all or most alumni respond to all items.

When you complete the questionnaire, place it in the envelope provided and mail it.

Thank you in advance for your assistance. If you have questions or comments concerning this evaluation, please feel free to write or phone Dr. Paul Lyons, Director of Graduate Studies, Frostburg State College, Frostburg, Maryland 21532 (301) 689-4231.

A. GENERAL

1. In what year did you receive your M.S. in Management degree? (Place an "X" on line corresponding to appropriate response).

_____ (0) 1971
_____ (1) 1972
_____ (2) 1973
_____ (3) 1974
_____ (4) 1975

2. Where did you complete the majority of course work in your M.S. in Management degree program?

_____ 1 Frostburg
_____ 2 Hagerstown
_____ 3 Frederick
_____ 4 Garrett County
_____ 5 Martinsburg

3. If you were enrolled in the program in one of the off-campus locations (Frederick, Hagerstown, Garrett, Martinsburg) you did not have easy access to the Frostburg State College Library. This is not to say that you did not have access to other libraries and similar types of resources.

Did lack of easy access to the Frostburg State College Library in your area of attendance affect your progress in the program? (Check one response.)

_____ 0 Not applicable
_____ 1 Made no difference in my progress
_____ 2 Made little difference in my progress
_____ 3 Difficult to decide
_____ 4 Somewhat hindered my progress
_____ 5 Greatly hindered my progress

4. With reference to your seeking program advice and counsel while enrolled as a student in the M.S. in Management program, would you please check the category below which characterizes your experience:

_____ 0 Not applicable
_____ 1 Advisement and program counseling were readily available
_____ 2 Advisement and program counseling were available but contacting faculty or staff was difficult at times
_____ 3 Difficult to decide
_____ 4 Advisement and program counseling were not readily available
_____ 5 Advisement and program counseling were practically inaccessible

5. How satisfied were you with the quality of the advisement and program counseling you received? (Check one response.)

_____ 0 Not applicable
_____ 1 Extremely satisfied with quality
_____ 2 Somewhat satisfied with quality
_____ 3 Difficult to decide
_____ 4 Somewhat dissatisfied with quality
_____ 5 Extremely dissatisfied with quality

B. PERSONAL

6. With my degree and experiences in the management program, I feel:

_____ 1 Extremely competent in my position
_____ 2 More competent in my position
_____ 3 No change in competence
_____ 4 Less competent in my position
_____ 5 Inadequate in my position

7. Because of the program, I feel that I have achieved my personal purposes in enrolling in the program:

_____ 1 Completely
_____ 2 For the most part
_____ 3 To a limited extent
_____ 4 Slightly
_____ 5 Not at all

8. Because of my degree in the management program, I feel:

_____ 1 Very highly valued by my peers
_____ 2 More valued by my peers
_____ 3 No change in value
_____ 4 Less valued by my peers
_____ 5 Not valued by my peers

9. With my degree and experience in the management program, I feel:

_____ 1 Extremely secure in my position
_____ 2 More secure in my position
_____ 3 No change in security
_____ 4 Less secure in my position
_____ 5 Insecure in my position

10. With my degree and experiences in the management program, I have been: (Circle 1 or more.)

_____ 1 Promoted
_____ 2 Advanced in salary
_____ 3 Given more responsibility
_____ 4 Other _____
_____ 5 None of these

11. In general, how valuable <u>occupationally</u> has your M.S. in Management educational experience been? (Check one response.)

_____ 0 Not applicable
_____ 1 Extremely valuable
_____ 2 Moderately valuable
_____ 3 Difficult to decide
_____ 4 Of relatively little value
_____ 5 Of no value whatsoever

C. CURRICULUM - GENERAL

12. The emphasis in the M.S. in Management is on general management, that is, the emphasis is on providing educational opportunities (skills, abilities, frame of reference) for managers and employees of a wide variety of organizations, both large and small, from the public, private, and non-profit sectors.

How valuable has the emphasis on general management been for you?

_____ 0 Not applicable
_____ 1 Extremely valuable
_____ 2 Moderately valuable
_____ 3 Difficult to decide
_____ 4 Of relatively little value
_____ 5 Of no value whatsoever

13. Would more specific management emphases have been valuable?

_____ Yes _____ No

If "yes", what areas? (Specify.)

14. How do you think the scope of the curriculum in the Management program could be improved? Please be as specific as possible.

15. How do you think the methods of instruction in the Management program could be improved? Please be as specific as possible.

16. How do you think evaluation of students in the Management program could be improved? Please be as specific as possible.

17. Are the courses taught at an appropriate level of difficulty (circle one number)?

1 2 3 4 5
appropriate inappropriate

18. In terms of your overall educational experience in the Frostburg State College M.S. in Management Program how satisfied are you with the instructional faculty? (Check one response)_

_____ 0 Not applicable
_____ 1 Extremely satisfied
_____ 2 Moderately satisfied
_____ 3 Difficult to decide
_____ 4 Moderately dissatisfied
_____ 5 Extremely dissatisfied

19. In terms of your overall educational experience in the Frostburg State College M.S. in Management Program how satisfied are you with the instructional methods? (Check one response.)

_____ 0 Not applicable
_____ 1 Extremely satisfied
_____ 2 Moderately satisfied
_____ 3 Difficult to decide
_____ 4 Moderately dissatisfied
_____ 5 Extremely dissatisfied

20. In terms of your overall educational experience in the Frostburg State College M.S. in Management Program how satisfied are you with the instructional organization (curriculum)?

_____ 0 Not applicable
_____ 1 Extremely satisfied
_____ 2 Moderately satisfied
_____ 3 Difficult to decide
_____ 4 Moderately dissatisfied
_____ 5 Extremely dissatisfied

21. In terms of your overall educational experience in the Frostburg State College M.S. in Management Program, how satisfied are you with the effectiveness of the instructional program?

_____ 0 Not applicable
_____ 1 Extremely satisfied
_____ 2 Moderately satisfied
_____ 3 Difficult to decide
_____ 4 Moderately dissatisfied
_____ 5 Extremely dissatisfied

Required Courses - Even though the M.S. in Management curriculum has been revised twice during the past five years, most graduates of the program have taken all or most of the following required courses. Please indicate the courses you took; then rate each course, first in terms of its value to you in your present occupational setting and secondly, in terms of its personal value to you. Please be sure to rate all courses you took. Use the following rating scale:

0 Not applicable
1 Extremely valuable
2 Moderately valuable
3 Difficult to decide
4 Of relatively little value
5 On no value whatsoever

Course Number	Course Title	Check All Courses Taken	Occupational Value	Personal Value
501	Human Behavior in Organizations			
504	Managerial Accounting (old- M.E.R.C. I)			
506	Quantitative Analysis in Decision-Making (old-530 M.E.R.C. II)			
508	Environmental Analysis (old 531 Written Analysis of Cases)			
510	Finance			
512	Process (Production) and Operations Management			
514	Marketing			
616*	Production, Marketing, Finance I			
620*	Production, Marketing, Finance II			
690	Managerial Policy and Planning I (old- Business Policy I)			
691	Managerial Policy and Planning II (old- Business Policy II)			
698	Management Consulting			
699	Advanced Management Problems (old- Research Project)			

* The 616 and 620 (P.M.F.) courses were redesigned and three courses (#510, 512, 514) were established in their place.

ELECTIVES Use this space to list any elective courses which you may wish to rate.

Number & Title	Occupational Value	Personal Value

A. Are there any courses you would like to see added to the M.S. in Management program at Frostburg State College? Specify.

B. Are there any courses you would like to see dropped from the M.S. in Management program at Frostburg State College? Specify.

C. What learning experiences outside the classroom would you like to see added or emphasized? Specify.

E. SKILL DEVELOPMENT

The following section has to do with the acquisition and/or development of a particular set of skills relative to your experience in the M.S. in Management degree program.

Please assign one of the following numerical values to each of the statements which appear below:

0 = Not applicable
1 = I believe my experience in the program has greatly enhanced my managerial skills in this area.
2 = I believe my experience in the program has slightly enhanced my managerial skills in this area.
3 = Difficult to decide.
4 = I believe my experience in the program has made very little difference in my skill level in this area.
5 = I believe my experience in the program has had no value in my being more skilled in this area.

SKILL AREAS STATEMENTS

In accordance with your evaluation of your own development in the following skill areas relative to the M.S. in Management program, please assign one of the numerical values above to each of these statements:

_____ A The identification of problems and the assigning of priorities to these problems.

_____ B Taking the administrative point of view.

_____ C The development of alternative courses of action.

_____ D Recommending and justifying a course of action (presupposes establishment of criteria and explicit recognition of assumptions).

_____ E Development of implementation plans.

_____ F Recognition of future implications relative to implementation plans.

_____ G Development of communicative skills.

Thank you for your assistance in helping us with this evaluation.

Please place this evaluation in the envelope provided and mail.

Data Management

1. Questionnaire mailed with cover letter, instructions, and postage-paid return envelope with respondents name on return envelope.

2. When completed questionnaire received, return envelope used as check for respondent; then envelope destroyed and respondent withdrawn from population listing.

3. Each questionnaire item coded and double-checked for accuracy. Then codes entered on data coding sheets for key punch. The transfer is checked and all punch cards verified.

4. Updated population list gives daily reading of response rate. Allows for ease in decision-making with regard to need for additional mailings to population.

5. The process above (steps 1-4) is completed for each population mailing.

6. When all data is assembled, SPSS program cards are prepared, computer program is applied to the data, and subsequent print-out is used to analyze results of the evaluation study.

Sequence of Events

1. Preparation of Materials
   Date: 10-24-75

2. First Mail-Out
   Date: 10-28-75

3. Return Tally
   Date: 11-12-75

4. Second Mail-Out
   Date: 11-18-75

5. Tally for Returns
   (same as #3)
   Date: 11-28-75

6. Decision Point for
   Second Follow-Up
   Date: 11-28-75

7. Preparation of Data
   Date: 12-5-75

8. Statistical Analysis
   Date: 1-15-76